

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERC United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria. Virginia 22313-1450

| APPLICATION NO. | F | ILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------------------|------------|------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/892,137 | 06/26/2001 | | Paul R. Stonikas | BLP 128.1 | 4376 |
| 24628 | 7590 | 12/21/2005 | | EXAMINER | |
| WELSH & | • | | NI, SUHAN | | |
| 120 S RIVERSIDE PLAZA 22ND FLOOR | | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| CHICAGO, IL 60606 | | | | 2646 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Commence | 09/892,137 | STONIKAS ET AL. | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Suhan Ni | 2646 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence address | | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | 86(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 Se | eptember 2005. | | | | | | |
| , | action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is | | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213. | | | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4) Claim(s) 21-34, 104-117 and 133-141 is/are pe | ending in the application. | | | | | | |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>133-141</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>21-34 and 104-117</u> is/are rejected. | <u> </u> | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce | 0)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). | | | | | | | |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti | Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex | aminer. Note the attached Office | Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | |
| 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: | | | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documents | s have been received. | | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documents | s have been received in Applicati | on No | | | | | |
| Copies of the certified copies of the prior | - | ed in this National Stage | | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau | · · · · · | | | | | | |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of | of the certified copies not receive | d. | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | | | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) Interview Summary | | | | | | |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P | ite atent Application (PTO-152) | | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 6) Other: | | | | | | |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment dated 09/30/2005.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 21-34 and 104-117 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-44 of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,130. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-44 of U.S. Patent No. 6,393,130 are similar in scope to claims 21-34 and 104-117 of this application with obvious wording variations.

3. Claims 21-34 and 104-117 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,207. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because claims 1-28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,207 are similar in scope to claims 21-34 and 104-117 of this application with obvious wording variations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) The invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 21-27, 29, 32-34, 104-110, 112 and 115-117 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Aceti et al. (U. S. Pat. 5,530,763).

Regarding claims 21-22 and 104-105, Aceti et al. disclose a hearing aid comprising: a deformable skin (2) bounding an internal region (Fig. 1); and at least one spine (5) extending axially along an interior surface of the skin, which is attached thereto sufficiently so as to provide insertion rigidity when inserted into the user's ear canal as claimed.

Regarding claims 23-24 and 106-107, Aceti et al. further disclose the hearing aid, wherein further comprises an output transducer (41) and a vent (Fig. 3), and the skin and spine, but not an output transducer, are distorted on insertion into the ear canal (col. 5, lines 27-35) as claimed.

Regarding claims 25-27, 32-33, 108-110 and 115-116, Aceti et al. further disclose the hearing aid, wherein a deformable matrix (1) applying expansive forces to the skin.

Regarding claims 29 and 112, Aceti et al. further disclose the hearing aid, wherein an audio output transducer (41) surrounded, at least in part, by a compressible matrix (Figs. 1-2) as claimed.

Regarding claims 34 and 117, Aceti et al. further disclose the hearing aid, wherein a faceplate (3) attached to the skin.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 5. Claims 28, 30-31, 111 and 113-114 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aceti et al. (U. S. Pat. 5,530,763).

Regarding claims 28 and 111, Aceti et al. do not clearly teach a plurality of ribs as claimed. Since providing a plurality of ribs formed on an exterior periphery of a hearing aid skin is very well known in the art, it therefore would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a plurality of suitable ribs formed on an exterior periphery of the skin of the hearing aid as a cerumen trapper, in order to protect the hearing aid.

Regarding claims 30-31 and 113-114, Aceti et al. do not clearly teach the matrix comprises at least one of open cell foam, closed cell foam, and a fabric as claimed. Since providing a desirable otoplastic material for the hearing aid housing is very well known in the art, it therefore would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was

made to provide a suitable otoplastic material, such as at least one of an open cell foam, a closed cell foam, and a fabric for the hearing aid, in order to provide more comfort to users.

Response to Amendment

6. Regarding the newly submitted claims 133-141 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed, which contains newly introduced limitations, such as "a continuously deformable matrix in the region wherein the matrix applies expansive forces to the skin". With all the limitations added, which clearly are not from the elected invention originally claimed (claims 21-34 and 104-117).

Since applicants have received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 133-141 are not original presented and elected and are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

7. Applicant's arguments dated 09/30/2005 have been fully considered, but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

Regarding the only two independent claims 21 and 104, the applicants state: "Thus, the fact that in the structure of Aebi et al. the diaphragm 2 is not attached to the connecting element 5 means that it cannot anticipate claims 21-27, 29, 32-34, 104-1 10, 112 and 115-117 as argued by the Examiner" (page 8).

The examiner respectfully disagrees with the applicant, and the cited reference (U. S. Pat. - 5,530,763) does clearly show, especially in Figure 2, that the diaphragm (2) is attached to the

Art Unit: 2646

connecting element (spine) 5, through other structures, such as an extension part (4) of the spine 5, or filler material under the skin.

Regarding claims 28, 30-31, 111 and 113-114, the applicants argue no motivation to combine the references. It is not necessary that the references actually suggest, expressly or in so many words the changes or improvements that applicants have made. The test for combining references is what the references as whole would have suggested to one of ordinary skilled in the art. In re Sheckler, 168 USPQ 716 (CCPA 1971); In re Mlaughlin 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971); In re Young 159 USPQ 715 (CCPA 1968).

Conclusion

8. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See M.P.E.P. § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a).

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE TO THIS FINAL ACTION IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS ACTION. IN THE EVENT A FIRST RESPONSE IS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION AND THE ADVISORY ACTION IS NOT MAILED UNTIL AFTER THE END OF THE THREE-MONTH SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD, THEN THE SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD WILL EXPIRE ON THE DATE THE ADVISORY ACTION IS MAILED, AND ANY EXTENSION FEE PURSUANT TO 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) WILL BE CALCULATED FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THE ADVISORY ACTION. IN NO EVENT WILL THE STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RESPONSE EXPIRE LATER THAN SIX MONTHS FROM THE DATE OF THIS FINAL ACTION.

9. Any response to this final action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications; please mark "EXPEDITED PROCEDURE"), or

Application/Control Number: 09/892,137 Page 7

Art Unit: 2646

(703) 305-9508, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Suhan Ni whose telephone number is (571)-272-7505, and the

number for fax machine is (571)-273-7505. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday

through Thursday from 10:00 am to 8:00 pm. If it is necessary, the examiner's supervisor, Sinh

N. Tran, can be reached at (571)-272-7564.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov/. Should you have questions on access to the Private

PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

12. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is (571)-272-2600, or

please see http://www.uspto.gov/web/info/2600.

SUHAN NA

PRIMARY EXAMINER

December 17, 2005